

# Baconiana.

VOL. X.—*New Series.*

APRIL, 1902.

No. 38.

## ESSAYS AND PLAYS.

*"Reason must be the last judge and guide in everything."*—LOCKE.

OF all the characters of the 1623 Folio Plays, none exceed in *cunning* Falstaff. In Bacon's Essay upon *Cunning* he introduces this:—"A sudden, bold, and unexpected question, doth many times surprise a man, and lay him open. Like to him, that having changed his name, *and walking in Paul's, another suddenly came behind him, and called him by his true name, whereat straightways he looked back.*" (*Cunning*, 1625). In the Play of the second part of *King Henry the Fourth*, the following episode is presented which very closely approximates the above situation. Sir John Falstaff appears, (with his page), walking in a London street, and exclaims:—

*Fal.*—Where's Bardolph?

*Page.*—He's gone into Smithfield, to buy your worship a horse.

*Falstaff.*—I bought him in *Paul's*, and he'll buy me a horse in Smithfield. If I could get me a wife in the stews, I were manned, horsed, and wived.

[*Enter the Lord Chief Justice, and an attendant.*]

*Page.*—Sir, here comes the nobleman that committed the Prince for striking him about Bardolph.

*Fal.*—Wait close, I will not see him.

*Ch. Just.*—What's he that goes there?

*Attend.*—Falstaff, an't please your lordship.

*Ch. Just.*—He that was in question for the robbery?

*Attend.*—He, my lord. But he hath since done good service at Shrewsbury; and as I hear, is now going with some charge, to the lord John of Lancaster.

*Ch. Just.*—What, to York? Call him back again.

*Attend.*—*Sir John Falstaff!*

*Fal.*—Boy, tell him I am deaf.

*Boy.*—*You must speak louder, my master is deaf.*

*Ch. Just.*—*I am sure he is to, to the hearing of anything good.* Go, pluck him by the elbow; I must speak with him.—2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. ii.

Observe how Falstaff was what was called a "Paul's man," a frequenter of "Paul's walk"—Saint Paul's Cathedral being used as a general promenade, place of resort, and business exchange at the period in question, even down to Bacon's

days. Prince Henry describes Falstaff with these words :—“This oily rascal *is known as well as Paul's*. Go, call him forth” (1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.). And although the scene from the Play does not take place in St. Paul's Church, nor has Falstaff changed his name, nevertheless when the fat Knight practically answers the Chief Justice's call, *by declaring he is deaf*,—he really gives himself away, and, in Bacon's words “*he looked back*,” i.e., acknowledges that he heard himself called ! The Chief Justice is not deceived—he is quite sure Falstaff *heard his summons*,—his deafness is only simulated,—a cunning that he puts on to escape reprehension of his faults,—for he does not want to hear anything good. Prince Henry, in commenting upon Falstaff's character, exclaims of him, “*Wherein cunning but in craft?*” (1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.). In a parallel of this sort, exactness of every detail must not be expected. Bacon presents us, in his Essay, with an example of a cunning man surprised out of his habitual caution, by suddenly hearing his name boldly called, and the like situation is presented by Falstaff's case.

In his Essay upon *Vain Glory*, Bacon observes :—“They that are *glorious* must needs be *factionous* ; for all bravery stands upon comparisons. They must needs be *violent*, to make good their own vaunts. Neither can they be secret, and therefore not effectual ; but according to the *French* proverb, “*Beaucoup de bruit, peu de fruit*.” “Much bruit, little fruit.” (*Essays. Vain Glory*, 1625.)

Of all the *followers and friends* of Falstaff, none answers closer to this description than Pistol. As his name suggests, he is of a fiery, explosive, or violent temperament, full of sound and big words, but of very little performance.

*Pistol*.—Save you, Sir John !

*Fal*.—Welcome ancient Pistol. Here, Pistol, I *charge* you with a cup of sack : do you *discharge* upon mine hostess.

*Pistol*.—I will *discharge* upon her, Sir John, with two bullets.

*Fal*.—She is *pistol*\* *proof*, sir ; you shall hardly offend her.

—2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.

\* It is hardly doubtful, that the name of *Pistol* was chosen with a keen sense of its appropriate character, as applied to this noisy, swaggering, swasher. For Pistol himself exclaims to Nym :—

For I can take, and *Pistol's cock* is up,  
And *flashing fire* will follow.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act II. i.

*Pistol*.—My name is *Pistol* called [*exit*.]

*K. H. V.*—It sorts well with your *fierceness*.—*Ib.* Act IV. i.



In a scene, laid upon the field of Agincourt, Pistol is introduced capturing a French soldier, who entreats mercy at his hands, speaking in the French language. Pistol's replies are highly amusing, from his complete ignorance of French. A boy translates for Pistol's benefit, and he replies to his prisoner's demands for mercy :—

*Pistol.*—As I suck blood,\* I will some mercy show. Follow me.

*Boy.*—*Suivez vous le grande capitaine.* [Exit French soldier.] I did never know so full a voice issue from so empty a heart; but the saying is true, *the empty vessel makes the greatest sound.* Bardolph and Nym had ten times more valour than this *roaring devil* i' the old Play, that everyone may pare his nails with a wooden dagger.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. iv.

This description of Pistol, as “*full of sound and fury,*” but *without much performance*, is echo to Bacon's French proverb, he quotes, “*Beaucoup de bruit, peu de fruit.*”—*Much noise, little result*; and if the reader will turn to the scene, cited from the Play, he will probably understand, from the amount of French introduced, the hint, Bacon gives us, in furnishing a proverb in that language, pointing at Pistol's noisy violence so excellently illustrated in his treatment of his prisoner.

*Boy.*—As young as I am, I have observed these three swashers. I am boy to them all three; but all they three, though they would serve me, could not be man to me; for indeed, three such antics do not amount to a man. For Bardolph he is white-livered and red-faced; by the means whereof a faces it out but fights not. For Pistol—he hath a killing tongue and a quiet sword, by the means whereof a breaks words, and keeps whole weapons.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act III. ii.

Bacon has declared that vain glorious men “cannot be secret, and therefore not effectual.” And in his Essay upon *Followers and Friends*, he says, “Likewise *Glorious Followers*, who make themselves as *trumpets*, of the commendation of those they follow, are full of inconvenience; for they taint business through want of secrecy, and they export honor from a man,

\* Pistol and Nym are presented in the Plays as *horseleeches*, or blood-suckers :—

*Pistol.*—Yoke fellows in arms,

Let us to France! *Like horseleeches, my boys;*

*To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck.*—*K. Hen. V.*, Act II. iii.

In Bacon's collection of proverbs, borrowed from Solomon, he observes :—“This parable was by the Ancients expressed and shadowed forth, under the fable of the *two horseleeches*, the full, and the hungry. For oppression coming from the poor and necessitous persons, is far more heavy than the oppression caused by the full and rich, because it is such, as seeks out all arts of exaction, and all angles for money” (p. 390, Prov. xxviii., Book VIII., *Adv. of L.*, 1640). Observe that Pistol obtains *two hundred crowns*, as ransom for the life of his French prisoner.

and make him a return in envy." (*Essays. Followers and Friends*, 1625.)

This last remark is very apparent in the case of Falstaff, and his followers, Nym, and Pistol. They betray him to Ford:—

*Nym.*—I have operations, which be humours of revenge.

*Pistol.*—Wilt thou revenge?

*Nym.*—By Welkin, and her stars!

*Pistol.*—With wit, or steel?

*Nym.*—With both the humours I.

I will discuss the humour of this love to Ford.—*M. Wives* I. iii.

Parolles, in the Play of *All's Well that ends Well*, is a glorious follower, also, (like Pistol), full of fine promises, and frothy words, but like all boasters, a poor doer! Bacon was probably thinking of the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, when he wrote this passage, as a finger post, for such characters as Ajax, Parolles, Pistol, Nym, and others of their class. Parolles is described "He's a good drum, my lord, but a naughty orator." That is to say—all noise, and little else." (Act V. iii.).

In my last article I pointed out how Bacon quotes from the Play of Plautus (*Miles Gloriosus*)—"Plautus maketh it a wonder to see an old man beneficent, *Benignitas quidem hujus oppidò ut adolescentuli est*, and Saint Paul, commanding that the severity of discipline should be used to the *Cretans*, accuseth the nature of that nation from a poet, '*Cretenses semper mendaces, malæ bestiæ, ventres pigri*.'" (Book VII., p. 354, *Adv. of Learning*, 1640.) In Bacon's collection of *Antitheta*, under the head of *Vain Glory*, is the entry:—"Thraso is Gnathoe's prey" (*Antitheta*, XIX., Book VI., p. 309, *Adv. of Learning*, 1640). Thraso is a blustering, cowardly, boasting Captain, in Terence's Comedy of the Eunuch. It is evident from these two entries, that Bacon had been very closely studying the Plays of *Plautus*, and *Terence*, with regard to characters *vainglorious*, from a military point of view. A *Miles Gloriosus* was a blustering braggadocio, or Barbason (see *Eunuch*, Prol. 31). I think that Falstaff, Pistol, Corporal Nym (Parolles and Ajax also) fairly may be classed under this head as Thrasonical, vainglorious soldiers? And certainly of all the characters in the Plays, none exceed them in the art of lying, particularly Falstaff, who in this point suffers no comparison!—In his relation to the Prince, of how he was robbed at Gadshill, his account of the number who attacked and robbed him grows from two to eleven! The Prince exclaims to Falstaff: "These lies are like the



father that beget them, *gross as a mountain*, open, palpable. Why, thou clay-brained guts, etc.”—(1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv). When we think of Falstaff, his easy art of turning everything that is against him to his advantage, by means of a falsehood immediately occurs to us! But there is one still more striking feature about him, and that is his gluttony (and his drinking propensities), represented outwardly by his huge stomach and slothful habits. Such epithets applied to him as “fat paunch;”—“fat kidney’d rascal;”—“a gross fat man;”—“the fat knight with the great pelly doublet,” (*K. Hen. V.*, IV. vii.) are endless, always pointing to him as a *glutton and a sloth*. He is described as:—“fat witted with drinking of old sack, and unbuttoning thee after supper, and sleeping upon benches after noon.”—(1 *K. Hen. IV.* I. ii.). Falstaff is so fat that he confesses: “Eight yards of uneven ground is threescore and ten miles afoot with me”—(*Ib.* Act II. sc. ii.) The Prince exclaims:—

*Hen.*—Peace, ye fat guts!

*Fal.*—Have you any levers to lift me up again, being down? ‘S’blood, I’ll not bear mine own flesh so far afoot again, for all the coin in thy father’s exchequer. (*Ib.*)

In every sense of the flesh Falstaff answers to St. Paul’s description of the Cretans, that is to say as a liar, an evil liver, a slothful belly, or glutton.

*K. Hen. V.*—I have long dreamed of such a kind of man,  
So surfeit swell’d, so old, and so profane;  
But, being awake, I do despise my dream.  
Make less thy body, hence and more thy grace;  
Leave gormandising.—2 *K. Hen. IV.* Act V. v.

St. Paul describes the Cretans, as, “*Unruly men, vain talkers, and deceivers*. One of themselves, a prophet of them, once said, Cretans are always *liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons*: this testimony is true.” (Epistle to Titus.) This is the passage Bacon alludes to, which he cites in Latin. Certainly Falstaff and his followers, Bardolph, Pistol, and Nym, in every sense, are “*unruly men, vain talkers*,” and in this last attribute the touch is in conformity with the subject (Bacon is studying in the Plays of *Plautus* and *Terence*); i.e., *Vainglorious Soldiers*! As “*evil beasts*,” certainly the text confirms the postulate.

*Nym.*—I will cut thy throat, one time or other, in fair terms; that is the humour of it.

*Pistol.*—*Coupe le gorge!* that’s the word? I thee defy again!

*O hound of Crete*, thinkst thou my spouse to get.

(*K. Hen. V.* Act. II. i.)

Nothing is so insistent in the portraiture of Falstaff as his fat—the outcome of gluttony.

*Fal.*—You make fat rascals, Mistress Doll.

*Doll.*—I make them! Gluttony and diseases make them; I make them not.  
(2 *Hen. IV.* Act II. sc. iv.)

As an evil liver, or evil beast, Falstaff is described as a "*Bartholomew Boar-pig*" (*Ib.*) The Prince describes him thus:—"There is a devil haunts thee, in the likeness of a fat old man: a tun of man is thy companion. Why dost thou converse with that trunk of humours, that bolting hutch of beastliness, that swoln parcel of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed cloak-bag of guts, that roasted manning-tree-ox with the pudding in his belly, that reverend vice, that grey iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in years" (1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv.).

In his Essay upon *Nobility*, Bacon says:—"We will speak of *Nobility*, first as a portion of an estate; then as a *condition of particular persons*." "As for *Nobility in particular persons*; it is a reverend thing, to see an *ancient castle* or building not in decay; or to see a *fair timber tree sound and perfect*." (*Nobility*, 1625.)

Sir John Falstaff is described by the Lord Chief Justice, as an *old and decayed man*:—"Is not your voice broken? your wind short? your chin double? your wit single? and every part about you *blasted with antiquity*? And will you yet call yourself young? Fye, fye, fye, Sir John?" (2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. ii.) In this same Play, Poins compares Falstaff to an old and *dead timber tree*.

*Poins.*—Answer, thou dead elm, answer!

(2 *K. Hen. IV.* II. iv.)

That is to say, *Falstaff is not sound or perfect*, and in this comparison, Bacon's "*condition of particular persons*," can be perceived, as applied very happily, to an example of nobility!

Prince Henry, in a passage quoted, calls Falstaff's lies "*gross as a mountain*."—1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv.

Bacon writes upon *Boldness*, "Nay, you shall see a *Bold fellow*, many times do Mahomet's miracle. Mahomet made the people believe, that he would call an hill to him; and from the top of it, offer up his prayers, for the observers of his law. The people assembled; Mahomet called the hill to come to him, again and again; and when the hill stood still, he was never a bit abashed, but said, 'If the hill will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet will go to the hill.' So these



men when they have promised great matters, and failed most shamefully (yet if they have the perfection of *boldness*) *they will but slight it over, and make a turn, and no more ado*. Certainly to men of great judgment, *Bold persons are a sport to behold*; Nay, and to the vulgar also, Boldness hath somewhat of the ridiculous. For if absurdity be the subject of laughter, doubt you not but great *Boldness is seldom without some absurdity*." (*Boldness. Essays, 1625.*)

Observe how Falstaff, after being detected in all manner of "*mountainous lies*," outfaces by boldness, and in Bacon's own words, "*slights it over, and makes a turn*" out of the difficulty presented by his detection, with "*no more ado*," than a fresh falsehood! After vaunting of his fight at Gadshill, *with eleven men in buckram suits*, the Prince thinks he will cover Falstaff with confusion and shame, by disclosing the true facts, *i.e.*, that the Prince, and Poin, were really the men who fell upon Falstaff and robbed him.

*P. Henry.*—What trick, what device, what starting hole, can'st thou now find out, to hide thee from this open, and apparent shame?

*Poin.*—Come, let's hear Jack: What trick hast thou now?

*Falstaff.*—By the Lord, *I knew ye as well as He that made ye*. Why, hear me, my masters: Was it for me to kill the heir apparent? Should I turn upon the true prince?

(1 *K. Hen. IV. Act II. iv.*)

Here is Bacon's "*turn*" and "*slight over*"—and "*no more ado*," of the bold man, which provokes our laughter. Observe how Falstaff furnishes amusement, or sport to all classes—to men of *great judgment*, like the Lord Chief Justice, to whom he exclaims:—

"My Lord, this is a poor mad soul, and she says up and down the town, that her eldest son is like you."

*Lord Ch. Justice.*—Sir John, Sir John, I am well acquainted with your way of wrenching the true cause the false way. It is not a *confident brow*, nor the *throng of words that come with such more than impudent sauciness* from you, can thrust me from a level consideration.—2 *K. Hen. IV. Act II. i.*

To this Falstaff replies:—"You call honourable *boldness*, '*impudent sauciness*.'" (2 *K. H. IV. II. i.*) This absurd scene, between the Lord Chief Justice and Falstaff, is a good instance of what Bacon calls the ridiculous. In another scene, Falstaff appears acting the part of the Prince's father, and affords this time *sport* to the vulgar:—

*Fal.*—Well, an the fire of grace be not quite out of thee, now shalt thou be moved. Give me a cup of sack, to make mine eyes look red, that it may be thought I have wept; for I must speak in passion, and I will do it in King Cambyases' vein.

*P. Hen.*—Well, here is my leg.

*Fal.*—And here is my speech ; stand aside, nobility.

*Hostess.*—This is excellent *sport*, i' faith.

*Fal.*—Weep not, sweet Queen, for trickling tears are vain.

*Hostess.*—O, the father, how he holds his countenance !

—1 *K. Hen.* IV., Act. II. iv.

Bacon opens his Essay upon *Followers and Friends* as follows :—"Costly followers are not to be liked ; lest while a man maketh his train longer, he maketh his wings shorter" (1625). This was an experience Falstaff evidently arrived at, for in the *Merry Wives*, he is to be found shortening his train :—

*Fal.*—Truly, mine host, *I must turn away some of my followers.*

*Host.*—Discard, bully Hercules ; cashier : let them wag ; trot, trot.

*Fal.*—I sit at ten pounds a week.

*Host.*—Thou'rt an Emperor, Cæsar, Keisar, and Pheeazar. I will entertain Bardolph ; he shall draw, he shall tap ; said I, well bully Hector.

—*Merry Wives*, Act I. iii.

The *violence* Bacon attributes to such *glorious soldiers*, as Pistol, Parolles, and Ajax, may be studied, in the second part of the Play of *King Henry the Fourth*, to advantage. Pistol is introduced as so *violent*, that Falstaff has to eject him, at the point of the rapier, out of the tavern where the scene is laid :—

*Doll.*—Thrust him downstairs, I cannot endure such a fustian rascal.

*Pist.*—Thrust him downstairs ! Know we not Galloway nags ?

*Fal.*—Quoit him down Bardolph, like a shovel groat shilling.

Nay, if he do nothing but speak nothing, he shall be nothing here.

*Bard.*—Come ! get you downstairs.

*Pist.*—What, shall we have incision ? Shall we imbrue ? [Snatching up his sword.]

Then death rock me asleep, abridge my doleful days !

Why then, let grievous, ghastly, gaping wounds

Untwine the sisters three ! Come, Atropos I say !

*Host.*—Here's goodly stuff toward !

*Fal.*—Give me my rapier, boy

*Dol.*—I prithee, Jack, I prithee, do not draw.

*Fal.*—Get you downstairs. [Drawing and driving Pistol out.]

2 *K. Hen.* IV., Act II, iv.

Another instance of this kind will be found in *King Henry the Fifth*, in a scene between Pistol and Corporal Nym. (Act II. sc. i.) Bacon has remarked that "They that are *glorious* must needs be *factionous*" (*Vain Glory. Essays*). This is prominently introduced with regard to the character of Ajax in the Play of *Troilus and Cressida*. Ajax becomes factionous to the faction of Achilles, and is full of *vainglorious comparisons*. Nestor exclaims :—"Their fraction is more our wish than their faction." (Act II. sc. iii.) And Ajax, comparing himself, with Achilles, exclaims, whilst full of the very trumpeting vainglory he is condemning :—



- Ajax.—What is he more than another?  
 Agam.—No more than what he thinks himself.  
 Ajax.—Is he so much? *Do you not think he thinks himself a better man than I am?*  
 Agam.—No question.  
 Ajax.—Will you subscribe his thought, and say he is?  
 Agam.—No, noble Ajax; you are as strong, as valiant, as wise, no less noble, much more gentle, and altogether more tractable.  
 Ajax.—Why should a man be proud? How doth pride grow? I know not what pride is.  
 Agam.—Your mind's the clearer, Ajax, and your virtue's the fairer. He that is proud eats up himself; pride is his own glass, his own trumpet.  
 —Troilus and Cressida. Act II., iii.

In his Essay upon *Anger* Bacon writes:—"The Scriptures exhort us, '*To possess our souls in patience.*' Whosoever is out of patience, is out of possession of his soul. Men must not turn bees—'*Animasque in vulnere ponunt*' (*i.e.*, lay down their lives in the wound). Anger is certainly a sort of baseness. As it appears well in the weakness of those subjects in whom it reigns—children, women, old folks, sick folks" (*Anger. Essays*, 1625).

Henry Percy, who was surnamed Hotspur, from his fiery, impetuous, rash, or *hot* temper, answers very closely to the first part of the above passage quoted from Bacon. In the Play, where he appears, he is presented as a man of so *impatient a temperament*, that he may be said actually to have (like a bee) laid down his life in the wound, *i.e.*, sacrificed himself and his cause. A study of the first part of the Play of *King Henry the Fourth* will endorse this parallel. Hotspur sought revenge upon Bolingbroke, out of temper, and would not listen to the sober counsel of his friends.

- Worcester.—Farewell kinsman! I will talk to you  
 When you are better temper'd to attend.  
 North.—Why, what a wasp-tongue and impatient fool  
 Art thou, to break into this woman's mood.  
 Tying thine ear to no tongue but thine own.  
 Hotspur.—Why, look you, I am whipp'd and scourg'd with rods,  
 Nettled, and stung with pismires, when I hear  
 Of this vile politician Bolingbroke.—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii.

This is the portrait of a man so angry, that he is *out of patience*, giving way to what, Bacon has told us, is a weakness of women—a "*woman's mood!*"

Worcester, elsewhere, in commenting upon Hotspur's contradictory temper, and love of crossing others, observes of it:—

Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage  
 Defect of manners, *want of government.*

This is Bacon's, "Whosoever is out of patience, is out of possession of his soul"—*i.e.*, out of self-government! Hotspur would not follow his friends' counsel, but (without his father's help), rashly urged on by his angry spirit, fought (with inadequate forces), at Shrewsbury, King Henry the Fourth, where he was slain. Truly, Henry Percy realised Bacon's words—he turned bee (or wasp), and lay down his life in the wound!

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

## CUPID IN THE SONNETS.

FRANCIS BACON, desiring to give to the world an example, or, as he terms it, a "platform," of allusive poesy, and at the same time to give just praise to, and a true estimate of, that marvellous genius with which he realized that God had endowed him, wrought out that creative marvel, "The Sonnets of Shake-speare"—a goal of poetic endeavour beyond which there will be no passing for many centuries. In the character of Cupid in his two manifestations as the oldest of the Greek gods—the god of creative or forming processes, and as the later smaller figure, "the little Love-God," Eros, or Desire, or Will, Bacon chose the figure by which to allude to his own genius or art child.

Bacon looked upon his poetic genius as "the world's fresh ornament," and in the first seventeen beautiful Sonnets calls upon that genius to reproduce itself in art children, closing with those powerful trumpet blasts of fame found in numbers 18 and 19. Thus it is that it appears by necessity to those who see the literal sense of these verses only, that this poet addresses a young man, presumably Southampton or Pembroke, and out of which literal interpretation, supplemented by the Stratford personality, has grown the absurd, debasing, and irreconcilable theories of these divine verses and of their supposed author.

In number 4 the person addressed is referred to as "thy sweet selfe," but not until 19 is there a probable allusion to the perpetual youth of Cupid in the line,—

"My love shall in my verse *ever live young*."

"He was five thousand years a boy," says Shakespeare.

Sonnet 20 is as nearly a key to the whole collection as could be composed. There, as we see, the "Master Mistris" of the



poet's poetic passion, has the face of a woman and the form ("hew") of a man, the word in the original Quarto being usually wrongly printed "hue" for colour or complexion. This person is "a man in hew" (form) "all *Hews* (forms) in his controuling," a direct allusion to Cupid as the creator, or former, and here especially as controlling poetic form. The fundamental meaning of the word "poet" is creator or maker. The popular name of "Love" applied to Cupid enables the poet to many times slyly allude to that god. Thus in 21 he is "true in love" and his "love" is as fair as "any mother's child." The perpetual youth of Cupid is again referred to in 22 in the lines,

"My glass shall not persuade me I am old,  
So long as *youth and thou are of one date,*"

and the chances are that the "good conceipt" which in 26 the poet thinks will be bestowed "(all naked)," is a reference to the attribute of nakedness given to Cupid. And in this connection it will be interesting to read Bacon's identification of Cupid with the atom, and his explanation of the meaning of this nakedness. The perpetual youth of Cupid is also pointed at in the first line of 151—

"*Love is too young to know what conscience is.*"

In 35 the person addressed is called a "sweet theefe," a most preposterous term to be applied to a dissolute nobleman who has robbed the poet of his mistress, but exceedingly appropriate for his art genius figured by Cupid, and in 37 the allusion to the one addressed as the poet's art child is obvious. Again is he called a "gentle theefe" in 40, with the added term of "lascivious grace," and in 51 we find that "desire" is the spirit which moves the poet and that such desire is made of "perfects love." The Greek origin of this wonderful youth is clearly shown in 53, where the form of Adonis and the beauty of Helen are but imitations of the poet's genius, with the added significant statement that the object written of is "painted *new*" in "*Grecian* tires."

The closing lines of 57 are also allusive of Cupid—

"So true a foole is love, that in your Will  
(Though you doe anything), he thinkes no ill,"

it being remembered that in Shakespeare's time the word "will" was synonomous with "desire," or "passion."

He is referred to as "my sweet boy" and "eternal love in

love's fresh case," in 108, and, to make the matter clearer, the one addressed is called, in 110, "a God in love." The entire propriety of these terms as referring to Cupid is clear enough, but applied to Southampton they become impossible. But think of the following line as referring to a thirty year old nobleman :

"Such cherubines as your sweet selfe resembles :"

Yet observe how appropriate to the character of Cupid the appellation of "cherub" would be. But we are hot on the scent here, for in 115 it is boldly stated that "Love is a Babe," and this is a clear and direct allusion to Cupid, and carries no other sense. Why is love a babe if this is not a direct reference to Cupid? But we find far more interesting and confirmative matter in the next Sonnet, number 116, in the following extract :

"Love is not love,  
Which alters when it alteration finds,  
Or bends with the remover to remove,  
O no, it is an ever fixed mark,  
That looks on tempests and is never shaken ;"

The allusions to Cupid in the above extract are again striking and profound. For Bacon, writing of Cupid, in "Origins and Principles," argues that Cupid represents the indestructible atom of matter, naked and imperishable in itself, but dressed in many different forms. He says :

"Now an abstract principle is not a being ; and again, a mortal being is not a principle ; so that a necessity plainly and inevitably drives men's thoughts (if they would be consistent) to the atom ; which is a true being having matter, form, dimension, place, resistance, appetite, motion and emanations ; which likewise, amid the destruction of all natural bodies, *remains unshaken and eternal.*"

Thus, further explaining the allegory of Cupid, Bacon says:

"But matter itself, and the force and nature thereof, the principles of things in short, were shadowed in Cupid himself. He is introduced without a parent, that is to say, without a cause ; for the cause is as the parent of the effect ; and it is a familiar and almost continual figure of speech to denote cause and effect as parent and child."

So, the friend addressed in the Sonnets is introduced as an orphan—without a parent, and here we find the origin of the last line of 49, as follows :



"Since why to love, I can alledge *no cause*."

The attribute of Cupid as an archer is used in Sonnet 117 in the lines—

"Bring me within the level of your frowne,"  
But *shoot not at me* in your wakened hate : "

The eternal youth of Cupid is again alluded to in number 126, the closing number of the first great series, in the first two lines—

"O thou my lovely Boy who in thy power,  
Doest hould times fickle glasse. his sickle, hower."

Even Sidney Lee has discovered the reference to Cupid in this number, after what he calls a "very narrow scrutiny" of the Sonnets, but looks upon this particular sonnet as simply a solitary, fanciful invocation to Cupid in imitation of similar exercises by some of Shakespeare's contemporaries, and little realizing that Cupid is the central figure of this great collection of lyrics. But the "lovely boy," in 126, is the same "beautie's *Rose*" of number 1; the "sweet theefe" of 35; the "gentle theefe" of 40; the "friend" of 42; the "beautious and lovely youth" of 54; the "sweet love" of 56 and 76; the "my love" of many Sonnets; the "sweet boy" of 108; the "cherubine" and "sweet selfe" of 114 and 151; the "Babe" of 115; the "deare love" of 124; the "fairest and most precious jewell" of 131; the "blind foole love" of 137; the "poore soule" of 146; the "cunning love" of 148; the "Cupid" of 153, and the "little love-god" of 154. It really would appear as if Mr. Lee's "scrutiny" of these verses was a little too "narrow."

One of the peculiarities of the Sonnets is the repeated references to the illegitimacy of the person or thing called "Beauty." In 124 the poet says :

"If my deare love were but the child of state,  
It might for fortune's bastard be unfathered,"

and in 127 we learn that "blacke" is the "successive heire" of beauty—

"And Beautie slandered with a bastard shame."

In the same Sonnet we also find that "Creation" is slandered "with a false esteem," a clear intimation that the poet looked upon his art as creation in the true sense, and being another allusion to the character of Cupid, the god of creation. And,

of course, Cupid in his later modified character was the illegitimate child of Venus, or as Shakespeare says, "that same wicked bastard of Venus, that was begot of thought, conceived of spleen and born of madness; that blind rascally boy that abuses every one's eyes because his own are out." And this attribute of blindness given to Cupid, who is generally represented as blindfolded, is glanced at in different Sonnets: Thus in 136 in the lines—

"If thy soule check thee that I come so neere,  
Swear to thy *blind soule* that I was thy Will."

And again in the first line of 137—

"Thou *blinde foole love*, what doost thou to mine eyes."

In 137, 148 and 149 our poet has clearly shown that he has had some experience with that "blind rascally boy who abuses every one's eyes because his own are out." Thus, Sonnet 148 is devoted to the conceit of the trouble to his eyes which love has caused him, and 149 closes with the lines—

"But love hate on for now I know thy minde,  
Those that can see thou lovest, and I am blind."

And so in 152 the poet states that "to inlighten thee" he "gave eyes to blindness," meaning that he blinded his own eyes to give sight to his genius. Bacon found in the character and stories of Cupid the most profound of all Greek philosophy, and his elaborate interpretations of what he believed to be an allegory are themselves striking examples of the delicateness of his perceptions and of his profound and penetrating thought. Explaining the alleged birth of Cupid from the egg Nox, or night, he says:

"Now that point concerning the egg of Nox bears a most apt reference to the demonstration by which this Cupid is *brought to light*. For things concluded by affirmatives may be considered as the offspring of light; whereas those concluded by negatives and exclusions are extorted and educed, as it were, out of darkness and night. Now this Cupid is truly an egg hatched by Nox, for all the knowledge of him which is to be had proceeds by exclusions and negatives; and proof made by exclusions is a kind of ignorance, and as it were night, with regard to the thing included. Whence Democritus excellently affirmed that atoms or seeds, and the virtue thereof were unlike anything that could fall under the senses; but distinguished them as being of a perfectly dark



and hidden nature ; saying of themselves, ‘that they resemble neither fire nor anything else that could be felt or touched,’ and of their virtue, ‘that in the generation of things the first beginnings must needs have a dark and hidden nature, lest something should rise up to resist and oppose them.’”

It is interesting to observe the dramatic fidelity with which our poet, in these Sonnets, maintains this character of Cupid as applied to his own genius or spirit. The birth of Cupid from night, the egg Nox, is clearly reflected in Sonnet 27, describing the poet’s nightly cogitations :

“ Weary with toyle, I haste me to my bed,  
 The deare repose for lims with travaill tired,  
 But then begins a journey in my head  
 To worke my mind when boddies work’s expired  
 For then my thoughts (from far where I abide)  
 Intends a zelous pilgrimage to thee,  
 And keepe my drooping eye-lids open wide,  
 Looking on darkness which the blind do see.  
 Save that my soules imaginary sight  
 Presents their shaddoe to my sightless view,  
 Which like a jewell (hung in gastly night)  
 Makes blacke night beautious and her old face new.  
     Loe thus by day my lims, by night my mind,  
     For thee, and for my selfe, noe quiet finde.”

And this is again further developed in 43, which closes with the couplet—

“ All days are nights to see till I see thee,  
 And nights bright daies when dreames do shew thee me.”

The idea of Cupid being “brought to light” appears in 152 in the statement of the poet that to “inlighten thee,” he “gave eyes to blindness,” and the “affirmatives” and “negatives,” which were the basis of Bacon’s system of investigation of Nature, re-appear in the “eye” and “no” of 148, unless we mistake the punning allusions. The thought that Cupid’s birth in darkness represented the necessity of seeds or beginnings having a dark and hidden nature “lest something should rise up to resist and oppose them” is reflected in 61, where the poet is obliged to “plaie the watch-man” for the sake of his literary child ; in 48, where he fears his jewell will be “stolne ;” in 124, in the assertion that his love is “builded far from accident ;” in 22, where the poet urges his love to be “wary” of himself, as the poet will also be wary

for his love, and whom he will protect as a "tender nurse her babe from faring ill."

The Sonnets give a prominent place to the conceit of a "hate" by the one addressed both of himself and of the poet, and there is good reason for thinking that this is but a reference to Anteros, the brother of Cupid, and who was generally associated with that god as the personification of Hate.

The Sonnets are too numerous to specialize in which the grace and beauty of the poet's friend is the prevailing theme, and which still further support the character of Cupid. Of that god, Murray, in his "Manual of Mythology," says:

"In early times his worshippers at Thespieae were content with a rude stone as an image. But in later times, and in contrast with this, we find him the *most attractive* figure among the works of the second Attic school of sculptors, the school of Scopas and Praxiteles, both of whom directed their splendid talents to adding *fresh grace and beauty to his form*. While artists rivalled each other to this end, poets were no less zealous in *singing his praises*—for he was then represented as lithe of limb and graceful of form, a model of ripening youth. As time went on, however, his figure became more and more that of the chubby boy who plays all manner of tricks with the hearts of men with which we are most familiar."

But if any doubts should remain as to the figure which the character of Cupid cuts in these Sonnets, the last two numbers of the collection should entirely remove them. Sonnets 153 and 154 have generally been considered by critics as not constituting part of the Sonnet series, proper, but as being duplicate exercises of the fancy upon the same conceit. A most remarkable fact is disclosed, however, that here is the same Cupid bearing his proper name for the first time in Sonnet 153, and associated with the later manifestation of the same god in number 154. Thus the first line of 153 says that—

"*Cupid* laid by his brand and fell a sleepe,"

while 154 opens up with the lines—

"The *little Love-God* lying once a sleepe,  
Laid by his side his heart inflaming brand."

Thus it is that these last two Sonnets gain a new and remarkable significance, and disclose that they are an integral part of the collection and form a fitting close thereto, for they simply tell us that the poet has ceased the exercise of his



dramatic art, but that the fires of poesy could not be quenched in the cool well of philosophy.

After a review of all of the allusions to Cupid which are found in the Sonnets, it is interesting to recur again to some extracts from Bacon's treatment of what he calls "the allegory of Cupid," as follows :—

"Let us now proceed to Cupid himself, that is, to the primary matter, together with its properties, which are surrounded by so dark a night. . . . But though Cupid is represented in the allegory as a person, he is yet naked. . . . The stories told by the ancients concerning Cupid or Love cannot all apply to the same person; and indeed they themselves make mention of two Cupids, very widely differing from one another; one being said to be the oldest, the other the youngest of the gods. It is of the elder that I am now going to speak. . . . He is without any parents of his own, but himself united with Chaos begat the gods and all things. . . . Various attributes are assigned to him, as that he is always an infant, blind, naked, winged and an archer. . . . Another younger Cupid, the son of Venus, is also spoken of, to whom the attributes of the elder are transferred, and many added of his own."

And thus in these Sonnets we find all of the attributes of Cupid directly alluded to, including the torch which the younger Cupid was frequently represented as carrying.

The Sonnets are divided into two principal divisions, the first ending with number 126. The second part commences with 127, and is generally referred to as the "Dark Woman" series.

In this latter part we find the character of Cupid still in the foreground, but it is in his more modern character of the "little Love-God," the god of amorous desire. This desire is also signified by the word "Will," which has so much prominence in the famous "Will" Sonnets—numbers 135 and 136. It is by the latter Sonnet that we learn through allusion that the name of the poet's genius is Cupid. The lines read,—

"Make but my name thy love, and love that still,  
And then thou lovest me for my name is Will."

But this is not Will Shakespeare nor Will Herbert, but it is Desire, or Love, those passions of the human soul for which Cupid stands as the personified name.

How faithful these Sonnets are to those early and later characters and attributes of Cupid is fully shown by careful study of the verses, and which also disclosed the amazing familiarity of the supposed untutored poet from Stratford with the most profound and recondite features of ancient Greek art. It is too much for one who "sang his native wood notes wild," but when we find him also entertaining the same explanations of Cupid as an allegory as Bacon alone has left us, it is time to pause and consider various things. Even the wanton character of the younger Cupid, or Eros, finds handy and faithful allusion in the friendly admonition of the poet to the supposed licentious Southampton, but which have reference only to the author's dramatic art. It is only just beginning to be realized how thoroughly Shakespeare was saturated with antiquity, and to what extent he revived the poetic and dramatic art of the Pagans, and which he clearly saw was founded upon, and was an attempted interpretation of, the phenomena and processes of Nature. Not without reason did he exclaim that the cheek of his genius was the "map of daies outworn," when poetic beauty lived and died as did the flowers before the false imitations of his own day; that in him the true and "holy antique howers are seene," without ornament, true to nature, and that his genius, figured or personalized by Cupid as the god of creative poetic art, was a map or picture which Nature was storing—

"To shew faulse art what beauty was of yore."

And sometimes we will realize what a world of metaphor and allusion was used in these Sonnets in the delineation of the features of his genius, but which he placed behind the most amazing veil of allusive art that the world has ever seen. The word "Nothing" is the only answer to his question—

"What's in the brain that Inck may character,  
Which hath not figured to thee, my true spirit?"

It was no idle boast when the poet asserted :

"And thou in this shalt find thy monument,  
When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent."

It seems never to have been considered by Shakesperian critics that it is a physical impossibility that such an art creation of fifteen thousand words as the Sonnets comprise, could ever have been devoted to the base subjects attributed to them.

Why the hermetic character of these verses was not long since generally recognized is something difficult to understand. It is true that some contemporaries of Shakespeare were anything but models of literary purity, but even Beaumont and Fletcher, chief of sinners in this respect, nowhere approach the depths of personal abnegation, sycophantic grovelling, unblushing lubricity, and salacious reminiscences which Shakespeare indulges in, if we give the Sonnets a literal interpretation. But Shakespeare was far and away above his contemporaries, both as a literary artist and a moral teacher. It is only in comparatively recent times that the great purpose of the Plays stands clearly revealed as an attempt, by the arts of rhetoric and example, to seduce men's minds to virtue, and to win them from their passions and prejudices. How utterly inconsistent with such a purpose and such a writer the Sonnets appear when literally construed is painfully apparent. It is likely, however, that the reported moral irregularities of the Stratford man have had much to do with preserving the debasing aspect in which these wonderful verses have been viewed. It is not remarkable that Stevens refused to print the Sonnets, called them "purblind and obscene stuff," and declared that an Act of Parliament could not make people read them. Certainly, it is time to find out what the mighty "Shake-speare," was aiming at when he penned these literary enigmas, if we wish to rest in any just conception of the Shakespeare genius or of the true personality of the author.

And the time will come when the "suspect of ill" which "masks the show" of these Sonnets will take its proper place, when Southampton, Herbert, the Dark Woman, and the whole horrible mess, will pass away from us like a frightful nightmare, and when the radiant mind behind it all will "pace forth from death and all oblivious enmity."

F. C. HUNT.

---



## "THE PARENTAGE OF FRANCIS BACON."

IN an article in the last number of *BACONIANA* under this title Mr. Woodward brings evidence endeavouring to show that Mrs. Gallup had good historic ground to go upon, if she was what he styles a "fiction writer," in framing the "Biliteral Cipher" story. This is a much better way of putting it than bringing forward statements in doubtful history as "corroborations" of her "facts."

First, we are informed, from a passage in Miss Strickland's "Life of Queen Elizabeth," that because Elizabeth lavished favour on the Earl of Leicester, "some sort of marriage between the parties might suggest itself"—a marvellous piece of reasoning! If Elizabeth had married every man on whom "she lavished her favour," we would have had a new phenomenon in English history.

Next, Mr. Woodward has found in the "Spanish Calendar" and other documents, what Mr. Bompas has rightly termed "malignant statements"—certain reports transmitted by men who were "ambassadors" at the English Court, but who at the same time declared that in these reports not the smallest credit can be placed. "Spanish spies" would be a fitting designation for the Jesuit gentlemen who invented these slanders, and who, as we know, attempted to depose and assassinate the Queen, and who maintained also that she and Leicester conspired together to murder Amy Robsart. De Quadra, the Spanish Ambassador, puts the case in a nutshell, as Mr. Woodward himself shows, when he writes to the King of Spain that "Catholics look only to your Majesty." And what reliance as historical facts can be placed upon the statements transmitted by De Quadra? On the very day of Bacon's birth, this De Quadra writes Philip that "one public rumour credits Elizabeth having some children already. Of this I have seen no trace, and do not believe it;" and within a few days of this he writes that Elizabeth was "incapable of maternity." This history, such as it is, is against the theory of Elizabeth having been a mother.

Hear what Hepworth Dixon says on the subject of the contemporary scandals in connection with Elizabeth's name: "This lie against chastity and womanhood has been repeated from generation to generation for two hundred and sixty years. It oozed from the pen of Father Parsons. It darkens the page of Lingard. . . . It came from those wifeless monks, men of the Confessional and the boudoir, who

had spent their nights in gloating with Sanchez through the material mysteries of love, and in warping the tenderness and faith of woman into the filthy philosophy of their own 'Disputationes de Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento.' Against such calumniators the Queen might appeal, like Marie Antoinette, to every woman's heart. Jealous of Lettice Knollys, of Bessie Throckmorton, of Frances Sydney! Elizabeth was indeed vexed with them, but had she not cause? Had not each of these courtiers married, not only without her knowledge as their Queen, but without honesty or honour? In secret, under circumstances of shame and guilt, Leicester had wedded her cousin's daughter, Lettice. Would the head of any house be pleased with such a trick? Raleigh had brought to shame a lady of her Court, young, lovely, brave as ever bloomed on a hero's hearth, yet the daughter of a disloyal house, of one who had plotted against the Queen's crown and life. Could any prince in the world approve of such an act? Essex himself, a member of her race, a descendant of Edward the Third, had married in secret and against her will a woman of inferior birth, without beauty, youth, or fortune—a widow who took him on her way from the arms of a first husband into those of a third. What kinswoman would have smiled on such a match?" Here, I am convinced, we have the real Elizabeth—not the fictitious Elizabeth of certain modern story.

Towards the end of his article Mr. Woodward asks certain questions with regard to Bacon's life, which I shall endeavour to answer.

I. "Why did she (Elizabeth) so frequently visit at Gorhambury and lavish so much wealth on Sir Nicholas Bacon? A self-respecting fabulist would infer that the mother was visiting her child," &c.

Well, Elizabeth no more frequently visited Gorhambury than she did the houses of other nobles of the day. Nichols, in his "Progresses," mentions that she paid a visit to Gorhambury, the mansion of her trusted but not favourite Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, on three different occasions. But what about her visits to Burleigh? She visited at *his* house (Theobalds) twelve different times, at his house in Westminster three times, at his house at Stamford twice, and at Cecil House three times—in all twenty times. Had Elizabeth children in all these houses, considering her more frequent visits thereto? As to the Queen "lavishing wealth on Sir Nicholas," this statement is

not confirmed in any one of Bacon's biographies. Although he spent hundreds of pounds in entertaining her, all he got in return was his salary as Lord Keeper.

2. "Why did they go to the expense of a bust of Francis at Gorhambury, when Sir Nicholas Bacon and his wife were also sculptured; or, at any rate, why not have one of young Anthony Bacon as well? Why, as the Queen had her portrait painted by Hilliard, should Francis, at the age of 16 or 18, have his painted by the same artist?"

There is a bust at Gorhambury of Bacon, as a boy, by an unknown artist, and there are also busts of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann Bacon. Anthony may have been abroad at the time these busts were made, as he often was.

Although portraits of Francis are plentiful, there is not even a portrait of Anthony extant, which leads one to suppose that perhaps his features did not lend themselves to successful reproduction in sculpture or painting, as his talented brother's undoubtedly did. As for the portrait by Hilliard, this artist was the first to work entirely as a miniature painter. Up to the reign of Elizabeth, no artist devoted himself entirely to portrait miniature as a profession. Hilliard became all the rage; and the Catalogue of the Loan Collection at South Kensington, in 1865, gives nearly forty examples of Hilliard's work, including nearly all the nobility of the reign of Elizabeth—Essex, Sidney, Drake, Walsingham, Somerset, Hatton, etc. What wonder, therefore, that Bacon is included in the list—as well as Queen Elizabeth and Anne of Denmark. The nobility rushed to Hilliard because he painted Royalty. And so it is at the present day.

3. "Why should Sir Nicholas Bacon, a very rich man, by his will . . . make no provision for Francis, and why, in 1580, should the Queen appoint Francis to the Court, make provision for his maintenance (Letter, Bacon to Burleigh, 15th October, 1580), and from that time forth continue to do so?"

Part of this query suggests most extraordinary history. Rawley answers the first portion of the question when he says that as a proposed purchase of land for Francis was "unaccomplished at his father's death, there came no greater share to him than his single part and portion of the money, dividable amongst five brethren, by which means he lived in some straits and necessities in his younger years." Abbott and Spedding write to the same effect.

Sir Nicholas was twice married, and the lion's portion of



his estate appears to have gone to the children of his first wife.

The Queen never appointed Francis to the Court, according to all his biographers, neither did she make the slightest "provision for his maintenance, nor from that time forth (1580) continue to do so." The letter referred to is evidently the one dated 18th October, 1580, in which Bacon writes to Burleigh: "I am moved to become a humble suitor unto her Majesty." The Queen and Burleigh paid no attention to his appeal [Spedding says the application "was neither granted nor denied"], and she did absolutely nothing for him. In 1582 Bacon became a barrister, and for the rest of the Queen's life—the woman who is said to have been his mother—"he waited for some post which his Queen or Burleigh might give him." He waited in vain—all that he got was a "Q.C."-ship, a grant from Catesby's fine, and the *reversion* of a post in the Star Chamber, which did not fall in till long after the Queen's death. Time after time the struggling barrister was passed over for office (by his mother?), despite the powerful but pernicious backing of Essex, and it was only some years after the Queen's death that he got his foot on the lowest rung of the political ladder when he was appointed, by King James, Solicitor-General, after which his promotion was rapid. Rawley, his biographer, tells this part of the story well in his quaint language.

4. "Why should the Queen from an early period have permitted him to take a prominent part in advising her in State affairs, and alternated so frequently in her behaviour to him?"

Only on one occasion, when he was 24, did he offer advice to the Queen. On all other occasions, according to Hepworth Dixon and Spedding, his advice was asked, as that of a man "rising in reputation." On several occasions he incurred the anger of the Queen because he opposed grants to the Crown, and made a stand against her in Parliament. This will readily account for the "alternation" referred to. Bacon's greatest "Royal commission" was perhaps the command of Queen Elizabeth (said to be the mother of Bacon and Essex) to prosecute and convict his so-called brother Essex. One might naturally ask how Elizabeth as mother would execute her own son, and how Bacon as brother would do his best to aid his mother to that end?

5. "Why did Lady Ann Bacon address practically all

her letters to Anthony, and why was Francis so formal and dignified in his communications to her?" (Dixon's "Personal History").

On consulting Dixon's "Personal History," I find that most of Lady Ann's letters were addressed to Anthony. This is easily explained. A huge correspondence of Anthony's friends with him (but not of him with them) has been preserved in Lambeth Palace, and these can easily be drawn upon for Anthony's life. But both in Spedding and in Dixon there will be found a number of letters by Francis to Lady Ann, *in answer to letters from her*, which have not been preserved. Besides, at the end of most of Lady Ann's letters appear such words as the following:—"Let not your men see my letters. I write to you, and not to them." "I pray show your brother this letter, but to no creature else." "Burn, burn, in any wise." "Let not your men be privy hereof." "Nobody see this, but burn it, or send it back." This advice was given to Anthony, who seems to have kept the letters all the same. When Francis was similarly advised, what more likely than that, with filial duty, he destroyed the letters, knowing his mother's anxiety on this point? Spedding writes: "Of the letters which must for many years have been continually passing between her (Lady Ann) and Francis, only two or three have been preserved." As to the "formality" and "dignity" of Bacon's communications to his mother, the "formality" was customary at that period. For instance, Francis begins one of his letters: "My duty most humbly remembered. I assure myself that your ladyship, as a wise and kind mother to us both," and again he signs himself, "Your ladyship's most obedient son, FR. BACON."

I have no doubt Anthony's letters to his mother are equally respectful, and not signed, after the modern fashion, "Yours ever, Anthony." Contrast the early letters of Queen Mary written to her mother with those of Francis Bacon to his mother: Mary's letters are addressed—"A la Reine ma Mère," begin "Ma Dame," and are subscribed "Votre très humble et très obéissante fille, Marie." Henry, Prince of Wales, addresses his father—"Rex Serenissimus," and concludes, "Majestatis tuæ observantissimus filius, Henricus;" while Charles I., when a boy, addressed his father, "To my father the King," and concludes "Your Mties. most humble and obedient son, Charles." Algernon Sidney, about the same period, addresses his father as "My Lord," and through-

out his epistle he speaks of "your lordship." This is simply what Bacon did in addressing his mother all through his letters as "Your ladyship." Then we have Frederick Henry, Count Palatine of the Rhine, son of James I.'s daughter Elizabeth, in 1624, writing "To the King" in the following strain:—"Sir, . . . Your Maties. most dutiful grand-child and most humble servant, Frederick Henry;" and this same Elizabeth, as the superscription of a letter to her father, puts it on record that she was his "Très humble et très obéissante fille et servante, Elizabeth." Even, at a much later date, Robert Burns, writing from Irvine, where he went to learn flax dressing, begins his letter to his father, "Honoured Sir," and ends it "I remain, honoured sir, your dutiful son, Robert." In these cases, as in that of Bacon, it was neither "formality" nor "dignity"—it was "respect," a quality which unfortunately has now long been lost in family correspondence.

6. "Why, though engaged to Alice Barnham, should he wait three years after the Queen's death (1603) before marrying?"

Bacon only became engaged in the summer of 1603, and waited three years simply because he was not in a position to marry. I married, I am not ashamed to confess, for the very same reason, when I was 40! In 1606 the position was altered, when he carried through the Bill for another subsidy to the King. Hepworth Dixon explains this thoroughly when he says,—“He was no longer poor.” When he was 36 Bacon had wooed Lady Hatton, who became the wife of his great rival, Coke.

7. "Again, when he did marry, why marry himself in kingly purple? 'Purple from cap to toe,' says the chronicler of the event."

I would say because he could afford the extravagance. Mr. Woodward ought to have known that with reference to a monarch, the words "kingly purple" apply to the purple *mantle* or robe that is worn, not to the purple *doublet and hose*.

8. "Why, when Francis lived at Whitehall during the absence of James I., did he lend himself to the accusation of arrogating to himself Royal state and power?"

I have consulted all Bacon's biographers, and can find no such charge. When James left for Scotland, the Chancellor's duties as his substitute were strictly defined, and these were carried out to the satisfaction of the King and the Duke of Buckingham. Bacon certainly took his seat in Chancery with a large display of show, to which the Queen and the



Prince sent all their followers. He delivered a great speech, of which he sent a copy to the King, and it was acknowledged by Buckingham in the following terms:—"His Majesty perceiveth that you have not only given proof how well you understand the place of a Chancellor, but done him much right also in giving notice unto those that were present that you have received such instructions from His Majesty." Had Bacon arrogated to himself Royal state and power, he would soon have heard about it from Cecil and Buckingham. Bacon certainly lost favour with the King before his return from Scotland, but it was entirely over the attitude he took up in siding with Lady Hatton against Coke, with regard to the marriage of Frances Coke and Buckingham's brother, and the question of "monopolies" to the latter. With regard to the pomp displayed, Bacon wrote Buckingham: "This matter of pomp, which is Heaven to some men, is Hell to me;" and the Recorder of London at the time had the courage to write to Burleigh: "My Lord, there is a saying, when the Court is furthest from London, then there is the best justice done in England." So far was he from arrogating "Royal state," that Dixon says:—"Lady Verulam was surrounded at York House by a pomp of swords and lace; gentlemen of quality, sons of prelates and peers, many of whom had been foisted on the Chancellor by Buckingham and the King beyond his need. As soon as he felt himself strong enough, he cleared his house of some part of this splendid nuisance, putting not less than sixteen gay fellows to the door in a single day, and making enemies of their families, their patrons and their friends."

9. "Why, when made Viscount St. Albans, was Francis invested with the coronet and robe in the King's presence—a form of peculiar honour, other peers being created by Letters Patent?"

I would answer, not because Bacon asked for it, or James granted it to him as the son of Queen Elizabeth, but because such investiture—personally—was necessary, and could not be dispensed with. Spedding says:—"During Elizabeth's reign no one had borne the title of Lord Chancellor, and no Lord Keeper had been made a Peer." This was reserved for Bacon in the reign of King James. If any special distinction was necessary—as it was not—Bacon would be the man to get it. Not only so, but when he received the title of Lord Chancellor, he was at the same time not only offered a peerage for himself (which he accepted) but a second peerage

"for his personal profit," which he generously offered to his step-brother, Sir Nicholas, but which was refused. If there had been any charge of "arrogating Royal state and power" against Bacon, it is most unlikely that any special distinction would have been conferred upon him in any exceptional manner—if, indeed, it was exceptional *in those days*. I maintain it was not. A peer could not be appointed by Letters Patent alone, without the investiture ceremony by the King. When it was proposed to make Ellesmere, Bacon's predecessor in the Chancellorship, a peer, "the ceremony of investiture could not be performed in the King's absence [in Scotland], and the question was whether he could be made an Earl *without* the ceremony." (Spedding. Vol. VI., page 166). There was a long correspondence between Bacon and Buckingham on the subject, as to precedents. None were found; but the King decided to make an exception by creating Ellesmere a peer "without either the usual ceremonies or delivery of the Patent by His Majesty's own hand."

10. "Why so secretive in his habits? . . . Why cannot even Spedding tell us what Francis was doing between 1580 and 1594? . . ."

For the very good reason that Spedding did not know what he was doing. Nor does anybody else. But Baconians have all along maintained that in these years Bacon was composing the Plays which he produced under the mask of Shakespeare. He was "secretive in his habits" because he was of a reserved and studious disposition and loved "peace and quietness." But what all these questions have to do with "The Parentage of Francis Bacon" is far from intelligible. If they are made on the grounds advanced by Mr. Woodward on which "Judges of the Probate and Divorce Division based their judgments," as Mr. Woodward says they do, I believe that every one of the judgments would be summarily reversed on appeal to a higher tribunal.

In conclusion, I would ask Mr. Woodward one question: If Queen Elizabeth was Bacon's mother, and if, according to Mrs. Gallup's Cipher Story, Bacon knew that Queen Elizabeth was his mother, how does it come about that in his Will he makes the request to be buried at St. Michael's, Gorhambury—"for there was my mother buried?" Till now it has been a matter of popular belief that Queen Elizabeth was buried in Westminster Abbey, a fact of which Bacon was probably aware, so that I am not surprised to learn that Bacon knew who was his mother better than either Mrs. Gallup or Mr. Parker Woodward.

GEORGE STRONACH, M.A.

## WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE : \* A CRITICAL STUDY.

BY ALICIA A. LEITH.

DR. BRANDES' most interesting book is worth studying, though its chief interest lies in a very different direction to that imagined by its writer. He claims that a parallel exists between the plays and the events and experiences in the life of their author. Which is not unlikely ; indeed, so probable is it that the plays reflected the states of mind through which their author was passing at the time of their creation, that we take Brandes' theory and act upon it within the limits of this article, only substituting the *real* author, Francis Saint Alban, for that man of straw put up, no doubt for some good reason, in his place for the better part of four hundred years.

As to all the personal references to William Shaxpur in Dr. Brandes' book, they partake of the same nebulous character we are learning to know so well. While claiming to prove everything the upholders of the great literary hoax, which still holds the world in its net, has no foothold to offer the searcher after truth. Dr. Brandes by chance has stumbled on what may yet prove a perfectly true premise, while his conclusions are all wrong, because he fails to recognize Francis Saint Alban, and not the ignorant Stratford player, as the true author of the plays he discusses so carefully.

The *raison d'être* given for *Hamlet* is the death of John Shakespeare, and the close affection *perhaps* existing between father and son ! A distinctly happier suggestion is that Hamlet himself may have been taken from King James I., or rather Prince James, allowing, of course, that the first original *Amleth* of Saxo Grammaticus was the foundation on which Bacon's more spiritual and philosophical Prince was afterwards built.

James Stuart, at twelve, had already assumed the reins of government, as Brandes points out, was at sixteen harassed by his nobility and obliged to dismiss his favourites, was a lover of plays and players—the son of a murdered father and of a mother held to be an accomplice in the crime which deprived him of life—was too irresolute and weak-willed to carry out any plans of revenge which he may have harboured and altogether fonder of study than of action. We certainly know him to have been of a contemplative spirit, a student occupied with poetry as well as with weird and occult

\* William Shakespeare : by George Brandes. Heinemann, 1898.



subjects, one who traced his descent, according to Lyte, through the Scots to the Danes, and who courted and wedded a Danish princess, hospitably entertaining the Danish King in one of his English ships off Elsinore, and afterwards in England where Christian IV. was a spectator of "The Black Tragedy" itself. On the whole, James was a far likelier model for Shakespeare's Danish prince than the warlike Earl of Essex, whose relations with Lady Essex's first husband are not now thought to have been of a nature to warrant his cherishing a desire to revenge the Earl's death. While discussing *Hamlet*, Dr. Brandes gives a local touch which, coming from a Dane, is interesting. An English traveller, giving a contemporaneous description of a great chamber in the castle of Kronberg at Elsinore, says: "It is hanged with tapestry and fresh-coloured silk without gold, wherein all the Danish Kings are expressed in antique habits according to their several times." Showing that Hamlet's reference to the counterfeit presentment of his father and uncle was not made without perfect knowledge of his surroundings. Wittenberg, too, was a college which Danes, not Englishmen, were in the habit of frequenting, being, as Brandes points out, Lutheran. As we turn with a smile from Brandes' obvious efforts to make the play fit in in some way, with the Stratford player's coarse, prosaic life, we ask: Is he right, so far in that he believes the author "transforms himself into Hamlet"? "What a terrible impression," he adds, "it must have made upon himself when he first saw and realized that his ideal had fallen from its pedestal into the mire." If the cryptogram lately claimed to have been discovered be true, then great and terrible indeed was that awakening for a sensitive and poetic temperament, when at an early age the young student discovered his real parentage, and realized all that it involved. "Time was," indeed, "out of joint" for him, then and always, and we may well believe he must have cursed again and again the fate that called on him to "set it right." Speaking of Wittenberg reminds one of Giordano Bruno, who was a student there. He plays no unimportant part with regard to Shakespeare. It has been mooted again and again by critics that these two great thinkers *must* have met, seeing that the English plays and the Italian's works contains so many kindred thoughts. Another score for us, because Brandes finds it next to impossible to reconcile such a meeting with the date of the player's arrival in London and Bruno's departure from it.

Giordano Bruno, the Italian mathematician and Pantheistic philosopher, born about 1550, visited England in 1583, remaining there till 1585. According to Brandes, once a Dominican Friar, he changed his views, and preached against the reasoning of Aristotle, and combated the Roman enmity to inquiry and learning in Paris, England, Marburg, Frankfurt, &c., thereby courting the death by the stake which took place in Venice in February, 1600. A man of his advanced views and deep intellect must have found in the young Barrister of Coney Court, Gray's Inn, the youthful member for Melcombe Regis, the fellow politician of Walsingham, Philip Sydney, Walter Raleigh, and others no less renowned in letters and public affairs, a sympathetic and kindred soul, a deep scholar, at one with him in all his new ideas, his love of freedom in thought and action, hatred of the old methods of reasoning, intense zeal for the advancement and improvement of learning throughout the globe. What we find is this, that Bruno is said to have "frequented the company of the most distinguished and leading men of his day," these being enumerated as "Walsingham, Leicester, Burleigh, and Sir Philip Sydney and his literary circle." Surely that comprehensive term must emphatically have included the most brilliant, as well as the most profound, thinker and writer of his day? Why, then, is the name of Bacon absent from the list, except that here as elsewhere the Brethren of the Rose, or "under the Rose," step in and veil their prophet? The very silence in this case is a strong proof that Bruno and Francis met as brother pioneers in a world ill adapted as yet to receive or accept them.

A Baconian silence enwraps Bruno while in England. Brandes naively confesses that he can find no trace of him in Oxford or in London, beyond the fact that he displeased the still antiquated college, and that the dirt and coarseness of London manners displeased him. The Bodleian, sworn to secrecy, says nothing, at least to Brandes. There are different tongues for different peoples, and diverse modes of expression suited to diverse races. The brothers of the Rose possess a language of their own, and a key to it which a stranger intermeddled not with. We read "that on the night of Ash Wednesday, 1584, Bruno was invited by Fulke Greville to meet Sydney *and others* to hear the reason for his belief that the earth moves," and their meetings were frequent, for Bruno writes that "we met in a Chamber in Greville's house, to discuss moral, metaphysical, mathematical

and natural speculations." Are we reasonably meant to believe that Francis was not one of that inspired few—why? I for one refuse to hold so ridiculous a view, and without a shadow of doubt I believe that Francis was one of the most frequent and interested of the guests, assimilating no less readily than Philip Sydney, his inferior in mind, the new tenets then promulgated, freely discussing, if not originating them.

Where is the wonder that Bruno's thoughts are reflected in the plays, and that Hamlet's determinism should by critics be traced to Giordano? who speaks of that which, "if it be now, it is not to come," and says: "Whatever may be my pre-ordained eventide, when the change shall take place, I await the day, I, who dwell in the night, but thou await the night who dwell in the daylight. All that is is, either here or there, near or far off, now or after, soon or late." And again, that he should say: "Nothing is absolutely imperfect or evil, it seems so in relation to something else, and what is bad for one is good for another." While Hamlet says: "Nothing is either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."

Montaigne is credited with influencing the author of the plays to no small extent, indeed more so than Bruno, for Brandes, to escape the difficulty presented by Shakespeare's non-arrival in London till after Bruno's departure, suggests that Lily and his Euphues presents the needful link, that Lily drew his inspiration from Bruno, and Shakespeare drank from Lily. It is to Montaigne himself, or at least to Florio's translation (though before its publication) that the author of *Hamlet* goes for his remarks on Alexander and Cæsar—according to Dr. Brandes. "Hamlet comes very near Montaigne," he says, and "on a close comparison of Shakespeare's expressions with Montaigne's their similarity is very striking"; and again: "Outside *Hamlet* we trace Montaigne quite clearly in one passage in Shakespeare—who must have had the *Essays* lying on his table while he was writing *The Tempest*." Gonzalo's speech, *A. II. S. I.*, we find word for word in Montaigne. *Book I. Chap. 30.*

"In the Commonwealth I would by contraries execute all things, for no kind of traffic would I admit; no name of magistrate; letters should not be known; riches, poverty, and use of service, none; contract, succession, bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none; no use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil: no occupation, all men idle, all; and women too."



It is a nation that hath no kind of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no intelligence of numbers, no name of magistrate, nor of political superiority ; no use of service, of riches or of povertie, no contracts, no successions, no partitions, no occupation, but idle . . . no manuring of lands, no use of wine, corn or metal.

---



---

"ARTHUR WILSON."

A BRIEF STUDY BY A. A. L.

A BOOK under this title was published in 1872 by Bentley, without the author's name. Its hero, Arthur Wilson, a poor friendless lad, of good parts, is engaged as a secretary by a wise man living in Stratford-on-Avon, his eyes being too weak by reason of arduous literary labours to make fair copies of his works. This learned man, whose wife is a Lucy of Charlecote, writes on "*everything*," with the exception of Shakespeare, whose plays he adores. His amanuensis becomes in time the High Sheriff of the county and stands in Parliament for Warwick. The writer adds those who wish to know more of him may read of him in Dugdale. There is, also, in the British Museum a Folio, published in 1653, under the title "Arthur Wilson." It is a History of Great Britain in the time of James I., and contains, for frontispiece, a fine portrait of the king. The Proem I print below.

PROEM.

"The Author's picture drawn by himself."

As others print their pictures I will place  
My Mind in Frontispiece plain as my face,  
And every Line that is here drawn, shall be  
To pencil out my Soul's Physiognomy,  
Which on a Radiant height is fixed. My Brow  
Frowns not for these Miscarriages below,  
Unless I mean to limit and confine,  
The Almighty Wisdom to conceits of mine.  
Yet have no envious Eyes against the Crown,  
Nor did I strive to pull the Mitre down,  
Both may be good, but when Head's swell, men say,  
The rest of the poor members pine away,  
Like Ricket-Bodies upwards over-grown,

Which is no wholesome constitution.  
 The grave mild Presbytery I could admit,  
 And am no foe to Independent yet,  
 For I have levell'd my intente to be  
 Subservient unto Reason's Sovereignty,  
 And none of these State-Passions e'er shall rise  
 Within my Brain to rile and tyrannise.  
 For by Truth's sacred lamp (which I admire)  
 My zeal is kindled, not Fanatick fire,  
 But I'll avoid these vapours, whose swoln spight,  
 And foaming poyson, would put out this light.  
 Vain Fuellers! They think (who doth not know it)  
 Their Light's above't, because their walk's below it.  
 Such blazing Lights like exhalation climb,  
 Then fall, and their best matter proves but slime.  
 For where conceited goodness finds no want,  
 Their Holiness becomes luxuriant.  
 Now my great trouble is that I have shown  
 Other's men's faults with so many of my own,  
 And all my care shall be to shake off quite  
 The Old Man's load for him whose burthen's light,  
 And grow to a full statue till I be  
 Found like to Christ, and Christ be found in me.  
 Such pieces are Grav'd by a Hand Divine,  
 For which I give my God this heart of mine.

In his history he says, speaking of noble families : " Where is there one (as that famous orator, the Lord Verulam, said) that like a fair Pomegronate hath not some corrupted cornel ? And may not that be picked out from the rest, but it must taint them all ? " This appears in his History, which, says the " National Biography," shows Wilson to be " strongly prejudiced against the rule of Stuarts." It is suggested there that it would have been better had he not attempted history but confined himself to other literature. Besides being an historian, he wrote plays which were acted at the Blackfriars Theatre, only one, it appears, has survived; this, " The Inconstant Lady," is published with an autobiography of the author. His father was Richard Wilson, of Yarmouth, in Norfolk.

At sixteen, after two years in France, he learned " court-hand " with J. Davis, of Fleet Street; became a clerk in the Exchequer Office, and was discharged for quarrelsomeness. In 1619, he made acquaintance with Mr. Wingfield,

Steward to Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex. Essex met him, and liked him, at Chartley, in Staffordshire, and made him a gentleman-in-waiting. He seems to have travelled with his master to the Palatinate, France, Holland, Breda and Cadiz. The second Lady Essex not liking him, he left her husband's employ, and entered Trinity College, Oxford, 1631. Here he went in for Physics and "drank with learned doctors of Divinity." In 1633 he became the Steward of Robert Rich, Esq., of Warwick. During the Civil War he lived on his master's estates peaceably, and was the means of preventing the Cavalier army destroying some of his master's property. He died 1652.

In Arthur Wilson's life of himself, he says he was seven years old in 1602. That in 1632 he was in Oxfordshire, and that on Shotover Hill he met an old man clad in a long black garment like "a Grecian," who wore a broad beard, and a hat, "whose brim was of an Eastern diameter," and that he spoke in a "strange, gibberish language," which was neither Latin nor Greek. It is a strange anecdote, and may be found useful on some future occasion. The same winter he spent at the Earl of Warwick's, his "Honorable Master's House."

He speaks of an "old natural balsam of Peru" (is not this Walter Raleigh's famous cordial which he sent to Prince Henry with the remark that if it was not poison from which he was suffering, he would be cured of his pains shortly—or words to that effect?). Wilson goes on to say that its "aromatick sapor is very penetrative, by letting some drops fall upon a peece of leather." Neat leather was an offence to the delicate nostrils of both Queen Elizabeth and Sir Francis Bacon. They both would have used the Balsam, no doubt?

Wilson mentions the "Comedies" which he "made," and which were acted in London by the King's players at Blackfriars, and at the "Act-time at Oxon with good applause," himself being present. He says he travelled in Germany, France and Spain, had "little skill in the Latin tongue, less in the Greek, a good readiness in French, and some smattering in the Dutch," and that he was "well seen in the mathematics," and was a "commendable poet." This is translated from the original MS. in a leaf prefixed to the copy of Wilson's "History of Great Britain," Fol., London, 1663, in Trinity College Library, Oxon.

Turning to his history of James we find an account of the Lords sending the Earl of Arundel to the Tower in 1621. The Earl had plenty of imprisonment, for King Charles com-



mitted him on his own authority for misdemeanours against himself, in 1626, thereby causing great disturbance amongst that august body. It was only owing to the Lords' repeated and urgent appeals that King Charles permitted him to return to his seat. This was the year when Francis St. Alban is said to have died in his house.

Wilson also remarks on the burning fevers that Henry, Earl of Southampton (Shakespeare's friend), and Lord Wriothesley, his son, contracted abroad. Lord Wriothesley, he says, died at Rosendale, his father at Berghen-ap-Zome, in view, and in the presence of, the relator. This is interesting, seeing that on the monumental tomb of the Earls of Southampton in Titchfield Church, Hampshire, there is no mention made of this Henry, whose little kneeling form as a boy, below the recumbent figure of his father, is pointed to now as the original of *Romeo*, and a personal friend of William Shakespeare. As a fact the parish register of 1624 does contain a notice of the burial of Henry Wriothesley, the Earl who died in the Netherlands, but there is no mention of him on the tomb, which contains inscriptions of some length on his father and grandfather. This is astonishing to say the least of it. There is a curious story extant in that parish that, some fifty years ago, a mandamus was granted, and a gentleman from London came down and opened the tomb for the purpose of finding a "Druce Mystery," a coffin buried with stones in it instead of a body.

*Was Henry Wriothesley buried in Titchfield Church or not?*

The tomb is now in the hands of the Earl of Portland by right of descent.

Now we come to the most interesting part, for us, of Wilson's "History of Great Britain." He speaks of Lord St. Albans, and says this: "He lost his peerage and his Seal, and the scale was wavering whether he should carry the title of Viscount to his grave, and that was all he did. Having only left a poor empty *being* which lasted not long with him, his honour dying before him. A pension allowed him by the King he wanted to his last, and had this unhappiness, after all his height of plenitude, to be denied beer to quench his thirst. For he had a sickly taste, and he did not like the beer of the house, but sent to Sir Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, in neighbourhood (now and then) for a bottle of his beer, and after some grumbling the butler had orders to deny him.

So sordid was the one that advanced himself to be called Sir Philip Sidnie's friend, and so friendless was the other,

after he had dejected himself from what he was. Wilson tells us he was of middle stature, his countenance was indented with age before he was old, his *Presence* grave and comely, of a high-flying and lively *wit*, striving in some things to be rather admired than understood, yet so quick and easie where he would express himself; and his memory so strong and active, that he appeared the master of a large and plenteous Store-house of Knowledge being (as it were) nature's Mid-wife. Stripping her *Callow-brood* and clothing them in new *attire*. His *wit* was quick to the last. Here he quotes the anecdote of Gondemar, so well known, and Bacon's quip in reply. "In fine," Wilson adds, "he was a fit Jewel to have *beautified and adorned a flourishing Kingdom, if his flaws had not disgraced the lustre that should have set him off.*" We heartily agree with the "National Biography," when it says, "Wilson would have done well to keep to his Comedies."

Anthony Wood tells us Wilson died at Felsted, near *Little Leighes* (the seat of Lord Warwick), in Essex, October, 1652, and was buried in the chancel of the church there. "After his death the said history coming into the hands of a certain doctor, had some alterations made therein, as 'tis said by him, who shaped it according to his desire;" which shows us how editors managed things in those days.

---

## REVIEWS.

MR. HAROLD BAYLEY'S book, "*The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon : An Appeal for further Investigation and Research*" (Grant Richards, 48, Leicester Square), comes at a welcome moment, and can be cordially recommended to Baconians. It certainly is a work that everybody interested in our fascinating subject should possess, or at least read. It is very well done, excellently written, and deserves the highest possible praise for the way the evidence is presented. Not the least charm of this book is its author's modesty, and the acknowledgment he gives those who have preceded him on this difficult subject. Every thorough Baconian will applaud the truth and courageous outspokenness with which he concludes his Preface:—"It is a deplorable truism that we English people know nothing, or next to nothing, of one that is perhaps our noblest countryman. FRANCIS BACON, instead of being rightly revered, or even respected, is to the majority, little more than a dishonored name. It is even more

*deplorable that as day by day new writers come forward with fresh facts, their evidence is unheeded or cried down.*" (Preface).

The last sentence is particularly happy. It seems, as if Englishmen, upon this subject at least, had entirely dethroned reason, and upraised passion, prejudice, and ignorance to reign in its stead! For what can be more extraordinary than an entire Press banded together to uphold the powers of darkness, and to deny England's glory, which shall arise from the doubling of her greatest genius, when the key works of Francis Bacon are rightly applied to the Folio Plays of 1623? One of the most curious chapters in the history of the human mind, will be furnished to posterity, by this prejudice and blindness, and probably will provide excellent example for some of the most striking theories advanced by Bacon, and perhaps fully anticipated, as well as illustrated, in his philosophy. In the meanwhile, it is no good arguing with those who contend for victory rather than for truth! For when men decline to accept, or to hear evidence, when they range themselves upon the opposite side of the house, they become no longer judges, but counsel, or enemies, who are in league to suppress a cause, or to defend *ex parte* prejudice.

Mr. Harold Bayley's book deserves an exhaustive review at our hands, but (alas!) space forbids little more than the briefest possible of notices. The work is divided into two sections—the first of which deals with "*The Mystery of Rosicrucians*;" the second part introduces, under the general heading of "*Deciphered Arcana*," interesting pieces or excerpts, gathered from the cipher discoveries of Mrs. Gallup, and Doctor Orville Owen. The first part is fully illustrated by most interesting plates (together with explanations) of Elizabethan paper *Water-marks*; *Printers' Hieroglyphics*; and *Mason Marks* in old Churches. Mr. Bayley has found as many as forty different water-marks in one book, proving that no printer, or publisher, would indulge in this extravagance of variety at his own expense; and therefore that some deep design lies hid behind these costly and almost invisible emblems. Particularly interesting is the collection of these secret marks, illustrated upon plates, which face pages 38, 39; attention being especially drawn to those reproduced from pages of Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, published at Oxford, in 1640. This book is really the first English edition of the *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (published 1623 by the side of the Folio Plays). As we know Bacon employed Dr. Playfer, and even Ben Jonson, to translate this work into Latin,



it is certain this posthumously published English version, *existed prior to the De Augmentis*, and therefore is most interesting. Mr. Harold Bayley presents several paper water-marks borrowed from this rare book, and observes that several (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 11), bear the initials R. C. The theory that Francis Bacon was at the head, or a member of the mysterious fraternity of the Rosicrucians, has been received hitherto with incredulity and scant notice. Mr. Bayley revives the question, and brings much fresh evidence of a most interesting character to bear upon the problem. Not the least of his many convincing proofs, are these secretly signed paper, or water-marks.

Another valuable feature of this book, is the collection of collated portrait engravings of Francis Bacon, and the Earl of Essex, as well as of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the two latter, according to the Biliteral Cipher narrative, being brother and father respectively to Francis St. Alban. There is to be traced, a certain resemblance between the portraits of Bacon and Essex, who are set side by side. At least, people who are opposed to the Baconian theories, *do perceive and are forced to acknowledge this likeness of feature*. It is especially noticeable in the lofty frontal dome, that characterises all portraits of Bacon and Essex, as well as in certain curve lines of the nose and nostrils. I have in my possession another portrait of Essex. I wish Mr. Bayley could have reproduced it, for the resemblance is in this portrait still more striking.

Mr. Harold Bayley contributes a most interesting bit of evidence, about the name of "TIDIR" (or TIDDER), (introduced in the discoveries of the Biliteral Cipher), in place, or standing for the equivalent of TUDOR. To many minds, no doubt, this strange archaism has been conclusive of the ineptitude of the cipher discoveries! The following is therefore important:—"There is an inscription upon the walls of the Tower of London, which may prove to be an unexpected confirmation of Bacon's cipher story. Writing in cipher, he says: '*My name is TIDDER*', spelling the word TUDOR with an 'i' instead of the more usual 'u.' 'Now turbulent Robert (Devereux, Earl of Essex) was on his arrest committed as a State prisoner to the Tower, and during his confinement he appears to have carved his name on the wall of his prison. The official guide to the inscriptions in the *Beauchamp Tower* says that over the doorway of the small cell, at the foot of the stairs, is the name ROBERT TIDIR'" (p. 101, "Trag. of Sir F. Bacon"). Mr. Bayley observes, "If this be coincidence, it is

little less than miraculous—because no prisoner of this name is apparently recorded, or known, to history or tradition” (*Ib.*). If my memory does not deceive me, in the first edition of “The History of King Henry the Seventh,” by Bacon (1622) the name “TIDDER” is introduced in place of “TUDOR?” As I am at the present moment, not in a position to verify this assertion, perhaps some reader will kindly if found, contribute the context?

I shall hope to be permitted to continue this most brief notice of a most absorbingly interesting work, in another issue of the journal? The appeal, the author makes in his title—“*for further investigation and research,*” is certainly no less urgent than he imagines. But what is really needed, is a further *appeal to the purse, in order to provide funds whereby the investigations and researches made, may see light, and be published.* A vast deal of most important discovery awaits issue, that owing to the unpopularity of the subject, and other causes, cannot find printers who will look upon the subject kindly from a financial point of view. An enlargement, or more frequent publication of BACONIANA, would meet the case, but for this funds are wanted. In America, works like the late Ignatius Donnelly’s, and Mrs. Gallup’s Biliteral, readily find subscribers who assist publication, or printers who risk the expenses. Over here it is different.

W. F. C. W.

## THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE CAMPAIGN.

THE battle of rival critics still rages, and seems likely to continue. Throughout the country newspaper paragraphs are circulated, and the journals that exclude the topic are few and exceptional. Most of the reviewers and paragraphists are bitterly hostile to us; occasionally our views are either adopted, or received with hesitating deference as possessing some plausibility. If a book or a letter appears on our side, however reasonable and scholarlike it may be, it is denounced as an outcome of ignorance and sophistry. Censure is so extravagant as to raise serious questions as to its *bona fides*. When a Shakespearean advocate of high literary position calmly announces that the invariable tendency to monomania in our ranks has been ascertained by careful

investigation of cases, he forgets the advice given by his idol,—

“Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot,  
That it do singe yourself.”

If any book might be expected to deserve respectful treatment, it would be that which our learned and scholarly colleague, Mr. G. C. Bompas, has just published.\* A discussion so calm, so studiously courteous and gentle, so marked by careful and original research, has rarely come under our notice. And yet the same measure of invective that is applied to the crudest Baconian advocates has been given to this. Strange that its high merits are so invisible ! For it is not simply a re-statement of the historic argument, it is a substantial contribution of new facts, so striking, so convincing as almost to afford demonstration of the conclusion which they support. We would gladly reproduce some of these new facts, but are not unwilling to leave them for our readers to find.

As a specimen, take the case of the gift of £1,000 to William Shakespere by Lord Southampton—a tradition much prized by some of our opponents. Mr. Bompas proves that the time when Shakspere made his first land investments, in 1597, was exactly the time when his profits as an actor made him very rich, and when Southampton's extravagance had so impoverished him that he had “joined the Paris Emtassy to retrieve his fortunes.”

Mr. Bompas also proves that Bacon was called a “concealed poet,” not only by himself, but by others. Also our author almost proves that some of the plays appeared before Shakspere left Stratford ; and that some of Bacon's early studies were distasteful to those who applauded his philosophical writings. And so the whole Shakspere myth collapses.

The exploded Southampton tradition gives a useful object lesson of the kind of basis by which current notions are supported,—doubtful traditions, faint rumours, irrelevant facts, unlimited conjectures, gratuitous augmentations, unlicensed imaginations, and hazardous assertions. All Mr. Bompas's facts are relevant to the issue. They are always supported by evidence capable of verification and by reference to authorities. Rarely is any merely probable argument even hinted at, and, if used, its grounds and value are distinctly

\* “The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays.” By G. C. Bompas. (Sampson, Low & Co.)



stated. Nothing more judicial, nothing more entirely reasonable has ever been produced in this discussion. It is difficult to imagine how its strong argument can be resisted.

*Per contra*, Mr. Calvert has published, on the opposite side, a very handsome volume, sumptuously printed and bound, gilded and glazed, adorned by excellent plates and portraits; a book to ornament any drawing-room table.\* And in saying this we have given all the praise to which it is entitled. It is so full of plentiful ignorance and sophistical argument that we are not at all surprised at the welcome which it has received from our very gentle critics. We were, ourselves, prepared for something worth consideration, perhaps a refutation of one or two of our cherished arguments. But as soon as we read the preface all those fond hopes vanished. The preface opens a fusillade of hot invective which never ceases through the volume; and as we proceeded we found that Bacon and all his advocates are not only entirely misunderstood, but unsparingly misrepresented. Mr. Calvert's hatred of Bacon is such that he is even willing to believe in any cipher contrivance of his devising, by which he might fraudulently appropriate literary credit which did not belong to him.

Some of Mr. Calvert's chapters are intended to crush the arguments or studies of our colleague Mr. R. M. Theobald, who, we are informed, writes "sheer nonsense," and who is credited with a variety of assertions which are not to be found in his book, and which no sane person would be likely to make. It is really very satisfactory to find that this fierce philippic is another over-heated furnace more damaging to its author than to the objects of his attack. For Mr. Calvert's crusade against the Baconian theory requires him to believe that Bacon was an unscrupulous scoundrel.

Is it conceivable that Bacon, as Mr. Calvert pictures him, or any other justly convicted criminal,—would leave his name and memory as a bequest "to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and the next ages?" Very few even of Mr. Calvert's own side will, we imagine, follow his leading in this sort of argument.

\* "Bacon and Shakespeare." By Albert F. Calvert. (Dean & Co.)

## TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

WITHOUT in any way discussing whether Mrs. Gallup's deciphered story is or is not correct, it may be of interest to notice that some of the evidence brought forward to prove that it *cannot* be the work of Francis Bacon falls to the ground upon examination.

Mr. R. Garnett, in his letter to the *Times* of January 3rd, objects to the phrase in Mrs. Gallup's Cipher Story "'our colonies in all th' regions of the globe, fro' remote East to a remoter West,' when England did not possess a single colony anywhere except in North America."

Spenser in the "Faerie Queene," Book I., Canto 1, Stanza 5, speaks of Una as the descendant

"Of ancient kings and queenes that had of yore  
Their scepters stretcht from East to Western shore."

Holiness is represented by Una in the first instance, but Elizabeth is also glanced at. Further, in those days when adventurers were sailing to all quarters of the globe, Englishmen felt that there was no limit to the possibilities of empire. Spenser, "Faerie Queene," Introduction to Book II., says:—

"Who ever heard of th' Indian Peru?  
Or who in venturous vessell measured  
The Amazon's huge river now found true?  
Or fruitfulest Virginia who did ever view?  
Yet all these were, when no man did them knowe,  
Yet have from wisest ages hidden beene,  
And later times things more unknowne shall showe."

In some notes sent by Mr. Marston to the *Times*, January 3rd, we read, "Was Bacon a Yankee? He spells words like labour and honour without the 'u.'"

Notice the spelling in the following quotations:—

"No sun shall ever usher forth mine honors."

—*Henry VIII.*, Act III., Sc. 2 (Folio 1623).

"Sounded all the depths and shoales of honor."

—*Ibid.*

"Peace, you ungracious clamors."

—*Troilus and Cressida* (Folio 1623).

"Every man in his humor."

—Ben Jonson.

In "Epistle Dedicatorie to T. Bright's Treatise of Melancholie" (1586), we find "endeavor," p. 4, and "to honor," p. 7. In the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621) we find "clamor," p. 12; "humor," pp. 74, 87; "labor," p. 213, etc., etc. The same words also appear spelt with "u." Examples might also be found *ad infinitum*.

Mr. Thurston in the *Times*, January 1st, objects to some of the phrases in the deciphered story as modern; but what could savour more of a present-day Americanism than "most elegantly done"? (Chapman's "Iliad," Book XIII).

A writer quoted in BACONIANA for January says "'twas" and "'tis" only

became common in the 18th century; but in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621) we find "'twas" once, and "'tis" fifteen times in the Introduction.

Mr. Candler, in *The Nineteenth Century and After*, says that "his" instead of "s" is found in Elizabethan writers, especially after proper nouns ending in "s," and that Mrs. Gallup breaks this rule by writing "Solomon his temple," etc.; but in Florio's "Second Fruits," p. 61, there is—"Dr. Grillo his phisike;" p. 134, "Lippotopo his mouth;" p. 183, "Ariosto his ring," etc.

Mr. Candler also draws attention to the use of words, such as "cognomen," "desiderata," "cognizante," "costive," "innocuous," "surcease," "satiare." In the Shakespeare Plays a word is often coined for some particular case, as "enactures," "incarnadine." Such words as "cognomen," "desiderata," and "cognizante" are not less expected than "incarnadine," and on the other hand "tortive," "persistive," "unplausible" (*Troilus and Cressida*), present as strange an appearance as "costive."

"Innocuous" is used of people in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621): "Northerne men, innocuous, free from riot," p. 82; and, "The patient innocuous man."

"Surcease" is used three times in the Shakespeare Plays, and also in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621), p. 45 of the Introduction, "satiare" is found once, and "insatiate" four times in the Shakespeare Plays; also in the "Anatomy of Melancholy," p. 671, "Pale Jealousie, child of insatiate love."

Mr. Candler asks, "If Bacon had written Plays, would he have placed a port in Bohemia?" Freeman's "Historical Geography of Europe" states: "In the end, between marriage and conquest and Royal grants, Ottokar, King of Bohemia, obtained the Duchies of Austria and Styria, and a few years later he further added Carinthia, by the request of its Duke. The power of that King for a moment reached the Baltic, as well as the Hadriatic, for Ottokar carried his arms into Prussia and became the founder of Königsberg." George Sand also says Ottokar II. had a seaport on the Adriatic. Furnival's edition of the Shakespeare Plays has this note: "Tschamer's 'Annals of the Barefooted Friars' (1654) says: 'In 1481 fourteen pilgrims, after having been attacked by Corsairs, landed at Bohemia.'"

With regard to the question of the translation of Homer, is it not possible that Pope and Bacon both consulted earlier versions? Dr. Johnson says of Pope as a translator: "If more help was wanting, he had the poetical translation of Eobanus Hessius, an unwearied writer of Latin verses; he had the French Homers of La Valterie and Dacier, and the English of Chapman, Hobbes and Ogilby. With Chapman he had very frequent consultations, and perhaps never translated any passage till he had read his version, which indeed he has been sometimes suspected of using instead of the original."

Two examples given in *The Nineteenth Century and After* of passages parallel in Pope and Bacon, but not in Homer, are found also in Chapman. Homer speaks of Pylos and Peteleon without adjectives, but we find—"Pylos' sandy coast" (Pope); "from sandy Pylos" (Bacon); "Pylos' sandy soil" (Chapman); Pope says "'little' Peteleon," so does Bacon; yes, but so does Chapman.



These few facts were noted in a short time, and no doubt a longer and wider search would disclose further evidence on the use of the questioned words and on the parallelism of Pope's translation to earlier versions. Four French translations were published between 1530 and 1715, when Pope's appeared in England, namely—Samxou, 1530; Salel, 1545; Salel and Magny, 1570; Dacier, 1711. Madame Dacier considered that Pope had availed himself of her work without sufficient acknowledgment. It would be interesting if some of your readers could compare Pope's Homer with these various early versions, and would then give us the results.

Yours truly,

E. J. DURNING-LAWRENCE.

### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRs,—In the hope of shortening the controversy respecting Mrs. Gallup's book, I would suggest that our Society ask that lady to be kind enough to reveal, in detail, the method by which she obtained the passages in her book, which are copied in the right hand column below.

The similarity of these passages to those taken from *Henry VII.*, shown in the left hand column below, is so striking that one is forced to the conclusion that the likeness is intentional, and I feel that it only needs proof from Mrs. Gallup of the correctness of this portion of her translation to establish confidence in the whole of it as a faithful interpretation of Bacon's work.

My suggestion involves, I think, but little labour for Mrs. Gallup, or for those who may examine the particulars, which I hope she will supply.

The passages referred to are :—

From *Henry VII.* 1622 Edition,  
page 11.

For that which concerned the entailing of the Crown (more than that he was true to his own will, that he would not endure any mention of the Lady Elizabeth: no not in the nature of special entail)

he carried it otherwise with great wisdom and measure.

For he did not press to have the act penned by way of declaration or recognition of right :

as on the other side, he avoided to have it by new law or ordinance ;

From "Bilateral Cipher," page 135  
(The Paraceve, 1620).

The desire of our father, who remained a simple Earl although he was wedded to a reigning Queen, was to make these affairs so well understood that the succession should be without question. To our mother no such measure was pleasing. By no argument, how strong soever, might this concession be obtained, and after some time he was fain to appeal the case for us directly to Parliament to procure the Crown to be entailed upon Elizabeth and the heirs of her body.

He handled everything with greatest measure,

as he did not press to have the act penned by way of any declaration of right,

also avoiding to have the same by a new law or ordinance,

From *Henry VII.* 1622 Edition,  
page 11.

but chose rather a kind of middle-  
way, by way of establishment,  
and that under covert and indifferent  
words;

*That the inheritance of the Crown  
should rest, remain, and abide in the  
King, &c.*

And again for the limitation of the  
entail,

he did not press it to go further than  
to himself, and to the Heirs of his  
body, not speaking of his right Heirs;

but leaving that to the law to decide;

so as the entail might seem rather a  
personal favour to him, and his  
children, than a total dis-inherison  
to the House of York.

Personally, I have no doubt of the correctness of Mrs. Gallup's work, for I have found much that corroborates it. Since my communication to the January Number of BACONIANA, I have noticed a number of things which have strengthened my belief. The vignette on "Four Hymnes," and "Teares of the Muses" in the "1611 Spenser" is unquestionably a pictorial reference to the Biliteral Cipher. It contains two female figures, the one holding a key, and a tablet with *five* letters printed on it; the other, a square and compasses. This reads, "The key to the Biliteral [*five* letter or *five* sign] cipher is the square and compasses." In the volume are several tail pieces showing the execution of Anne Boleyn, not with axe and block, but with a sword. I have an old print in which her execution is so depicted. The incident is emphasized on the last page of the recently published "Tragedy of Anne Boleyn." Other head and tail pieces in the 1611 Spenser illustrate passages in Mrs. Gallup's book. In the 1632 Edition of Bacon's Essays, the Essays numbered 12, 17, 19, 27, and 40, have I for their initial letter. On the left of that letter there is, in each case, a diminutive T and on the right a diminutive D. This gives TID, the first syllable of the name "TIDDER" in Mrs. Gallup's book. The only initial F in the book is that in the Essay "Of Delays," which is numbered 21. The number is the sum of 10 and 11, which as mentioned in my former letter represent F. B.

We have :—Initial letter F. = 10 and number of Essay 21 = 10 + 11.  
F. B.

And if we add ... B. = 11 ... .. 11

We get ... .. F. B. = 21 ... .. 32

From "Biliteral Cipher," page 135  
(The Paraceve, 1620).

but choosing a course between the  
two, by way of sure establishment,

under covert and indifferent words,

that the inheritance of this Crown,  
as hath been mentioned here, rest,  
remain, and abide in the Queen,

and as for limitation of the entail,

he stopt with the heirs of the  
Queen's body,  
not saying the right heirs,

thereby leaving it to the law to  
decide,

so as the entail might rather seem a  
favour to her, Elizabeth, and to  
their children, than as intended dis-  
inherison to the House of Stuart.

Now turn to Essay 32, and we find the *only* pictorial initial, commencing an Essay in this Edition. It contains an S *printed upside down* in a picture with a man holding a spear. In the back ground is a mountain with a river at its foot. May we not reasonably assume that these represent Shakespeare, Mount Parnassus, and the River Helicon? The initial of Essay 32 in the 1629 Edition is identical with this one, although those of all the other Essays in that Edition differ from the initials in the 1632 Edition.

Yours faithfully,

A. J. WILLIAMS.

77, Colmore Row, Birmingham, 10th March, 1902.

---

### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

MR. A. J. WILLIAMS, in a letter published in *BACONIANA*, January, 1902, calls attention to the fact that in the Folio Edition of "Shakespeare's Plays (1623)" twenty-five of the Plays have a tailpiece, and eleven have none, twenty-five have headpieces properly printed, and eleven have them reversed. He asks if the same arrangement is observed in the Folios of 1632 and 1664.

In the 1632 Folio, the designs employed in the headpieces are the same as in that of 1623, but only in three cases, namely, over "King John," II. Part "Henry VI.," and "Richard III.," do they coincide in design and position. Of the thirty-six headpieces, ten are printed correctly and twenty-six are reversed. There does not seem to be systematic coincidence between those reversed in the two Folios; for example, on comparing the eleven reversed in the Folio of 1623 with the headpieces of the corresponding Plays in 1632, two are the same design and similarly reversed; six are the same design, but correctly printed; three are different design, though reversed. Of the Plays of 1632, twenty-one have tailpieces, and fifteen have none. The coincidence in the use of the tailpieces is more marked, as of the twenty-five Plays of 1623 which have tailpieces, twenty-one correspond to the twenty-one of the 1632 Folio. The designs differ except in one instance, "Henry VI.," Part I. The presence of tailpieces does not depend on the space at the end of the Plays, as often there is room enough, but it has not been used.

In the 1664 Folio, the headpieces are different from those in the previous Folios, and not any of them are reversed. Omitting the last seven Plays which the 1664 Folio has, in addition to the thirty-six of the other two Folios, there are twenty-two with tailpieces and fourteen without. Here, twenty-two of the twenty-five Plays with tailpieces in the 1623 Folio correspond to the twenty-two of the 1664 Folio, but none are like in design.

C. I. SHAWCROSS.

---

SIR,—Can any reader offer an explanation why Francis Bacon is not included in the *House List* of Trinity College, Cambridge. Anthony is. A detailed Life of Anthony is given, and his "illustrious brother," Francis, is mentioned as being with him and matriculating, June, 1573. *No Life of Francis is given.* *Athenae Cantabrigiensis* (Cooper).

AN ENQUIRER



SIR,—Isaac D'Israeli says that Queen Anne of Denmark had a "rhyming and fantastical Secretary" called Sir William Fowler. Has it ever been suggested that he was the origin of "Malvolio?" Can any of your readers furnish any information on this point?

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

SIR,—With reference to the statement made that if Queen Elizabeth were married to Leicester her issue had no right to the throne, I quote from Hepworth Dixon, p. 124 of "Her Majesty's Tower." Copyright Edition. (1841. 16mo.) Charles Brandon married Mary, younger sister of Henry VII., secretly. "Her rights descended to Frances, though not without legal flaw, since, at the time of the Queen's marriage with Brandon that nobleman had a wife alive." And again, Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset, "had a wife alive when he married Frances." Her father's and grandfather's bigamy did not debar Lady Jane from being crowned Queen.

Yours truly,

A. A. L.

March, 1902.

### REPLY TO AN ENQUIRY.

CONCERNING the inquiry of "A. A. L." in the October issue of BACONIANA regarding the skull of Essex, there is in Bayle, 1736, under "Goutant" an account of Elizabeth exhibiting it to Goutant (Biron), and the marginal references may enable one to trace to its earliest sources the fact that Elizabeth kept Essex's hand and exposed it to visiting courtiers.

### ERRATA.—JANUARY, 1902.

Page 12.—In Matthew Arnold's poem on "Shakespeare," line 3, delete the first "his."

Page 16, line 17.—For "Peasusagus," read "Prasutagus."

Page 16, last line.—For "mantel," read "mantle."

Page 11, line 22.—For "in the Scottish paper *The People*," read "in the *Stratford-on-Avon Herald* from 7th October, 1898, to 24th March, 1899."

Page 21, line 15.—A line of poetry was omitted. It should read.—

"Which after, by devouring time abused,  
Into the dying parts had life infused,  
By James the First of England, to become  
The glory of Alban's proto-ma:tyrdom."

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

---

**The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon.** An Appeal for Further Investigation and Research. By Harold Bayley. Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s. net. This book is an attempt to throw further light on the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, but it does much more than this. The author's evidence goes to prove that the secret fraternity of learned men known to history as the Rosicrucians, or the Brethren of the Rose and Cross, was really a company of writers with whom Bacon was closely associated, and under whose auspices the plays known as Shakespeare's, and also a considerable number of other works of the period, were written and published. These works were secretly hall-marked, and are to be identified by peculiar and distinctive emblems, in the form of paper-marks, printers' ornaments, and woodcuts. The volume is illustrated by several portraits and sixty reproductions of Rosicrucian symbols.

**The Biliteral Cipher: Hints for Deciphering.** By Mrs. Henry Pott. Price 6d.

**Obiter Dicta of Bacon and Shakespeare on Mind, Manners, Morals.** By Mrs. Henry Pott. Handsome cloth, gilt side and back, price 4s. 6d. net. Post free for postal order. 316 pages, crown 8vo.

**Did Francis Bacon Write Shakespeare?** Part I., "Thirty-two Reasons for Believing that He did"; Part II., "The Lives of Bacon and Shakespeare Compared"—two handbooks by Mrs. H. Pott; also Parts III. IV., V. (R. Banks and Son, 5, Racquet-court, Fleet-street, E.C.) Price 1s. each, post free 1s. 2d.

**Bacon or Shakespeare?** Compiled by Colonel Francis C. Maude, V.C., C.B. Paper cover, price 1s.

**1892 "Baconiana" Volumes.** Vol. I., London, May, 1893, to February, 1894; Vol. II., 1894-5; Vol. III., 1895 (all published by R. Banks Racquet-court, Fleet-street). Price 6s. each.

**"The Shakespearean Myth: William Shakspeare and Circumstantial Evidence.** By Appleton Morgan, A.M., LL.B., Author of "Notes to Best's Principles of Evidence."

**The Great Cryptogram.** By the Hon. Ignatius Donnelly, author of "Atlantis," "Ragnarok," "Dr. Huguet," (1888; Chicago, New York: R. Peale and Co.; London: Sampson, Marston.) Parts I. and II. are elaborate arguments, with evidence concerning the authorship. Following upon the 13 Essays which support this part of the contention is Part III., "Parallelisms" of Expressions Metaphors, Opinions, Quotations, Studies, Errors, Identities of Style, Character, &c. Vol. II. is devoted to the much-discussed Cipher, concerning which it is certain that the last word has not yet been said.

**The Bi-Literal Cipher of Sir Francis Bacon.** Discovered in his Works, and Deciphered by Mrs. E. W. Gallup. Third Edition, with a large quantity of new deciphered matter. Large 8vo., with many facsimiles, paper covers, 6s. net; cloth, 15s. net.

---

\*These pamphlets and most other works on the subject may be obtained of ROBERT BANKS AND SON, Racquet-court, Fleet-street, London. Volumes marked thus (\*) are *out of print*, but MESSRS. BANKS will, if possible, obtain second-hand copies.